

told me he kind of had the best luck gently blowing in their ear. Is that sexual contact? Is that a violation? It is obviously done for "sexual arousal." Now if a nineteen year old college kid is laying on the beach tickling the toes of a fifteen year old, fourteen year, three hundred sixty four day student, that is felonious conduct under this bill but I would like everybody to think about something else. How many sitting in this room right now who are married are more than four years older than their mate? I repeat, how many are more than four years older than their mate because that is about where we are. We are saying dating at the normal dating ages, starting, and quite frankly they start about thirteen, fourteen dating, pretty heavily a lot of them. How many dated somebody four years or more older than you? Think back if you did? Were you a felon too? Would you be a felon under this law? I'm not going to support the bill. I think you went too far when you went with the fourteen. I thought thirteen was somewhat foolish but reasonable but I repeat, you are not talking about forced anything. You keep talking about actor and victim. I guess that is going to be the fun in the courtroom, deciding who was the actor and who was the victim, isn't it? Did so and so kiss so and so or did so and so kiss so and so? We pass foolish laws in here from time to time. I have even--yes, even I have supported some on occasion but this one I think I will pass on.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Pirsch.

SENATOR PIRSCH: John, you're really a card but I must say I kind of resent being called a Hell's Angels that you're surrounded by. In the first place this is our child molestation law that we are in. It is nothing new. There is going to be no new interpretations because this is old law. Sexual contact is defined and has been defined for years, will be interpreted and has been interpreted as it has been for years. There is nothing new in that description of sexual contact. Now I wanted to change that. Senator Chambers brought up a good point when he said, "for sexual arousal or gratification," and I thought maybe it should be nonmedical or nonhealth purposes as we do in the penetration but sexual contact is different than penetration, very much different and so, therefore, I went along with the committee amendment which left it as it was because it can be interpreted, it has been instilled in law.